

Etymological
Research
into Old Church
Slavonic

Proceedings of the
Etymological Symposium Brno 2014,
9–11 September 2014, Brno

Edited by
Ilona Janyšková
& Helena Karlíková

Nakladatelství
Lidové noviny
Praha 2015

JASNA VLAJIĆ-POPOVIĆ: CHURCH SLAVONIC *ŽĹĹĹĹĹ* 'DESIDERARE, CUPERE' – RELICT OR INNOVATION

Abstract: This paper addresses the problematic nature of the current (from Miklosich to Derksen) supposition about the Proto-Slavic, implicitly also Proto-Indo-European, antiquity of the verb **žĹĹĹĹĹ* 'desiderare, cupere'. On the level of Church Slavonic, its absence from Russian Church Slavonic is proven and the autochthonous nature of its Old Russian derivatives is denied – these turn out to be of South Slavonic provenance. The absence of continuity of either the verb or its derivatives in Bulgarian is also noted. However, in Serbo-Croatian, in the central Štokavian terrain, it is exceptionally well documented, continually from the 13th c. to the present day – in both literary Serbian (starting from Serbian Slavonic) and in folklore, including modern attestations in dialects. Hence, the possibility of the Old Church Slavonic antiquity of the verb being practically ruled out, an alternative interpretation is offered: S.-Cr. *žud(j)eti* may be a locally developed formation, secondary to the adjective *žedan* (< **žĹĹĹĹĹ*), through its earlier form **žindinŭ* which through a dissimilation *n – n > l – n* could have yielded **žildinŭ > žĹĹĹĹĹ*. Formal-semantic and typological parallels to such a development, with examples from Serbian and other languages, Slavic and non-Slavic, are presented. **Keywords:** etymology, relict, innovation, Proto-Slavic **žĹĹĹĹĹ* 'desiderare, cupere', Church Slavonic, Serbian.

0 The presumably Proto-Slavic verb **žĹĹĹĹĹ* 'desiderare, cupere' – after Miklosich (1862–1865: 199, and 1886: 62; cf. also Berneker 1908–1913: 320 s.v. *goldŭ*) recorded in etymological dictionaries of the only two languages supposedly featuring its continuants, *Фасмер* and *Skok* – current Proto-Slavic etymological dictionaries have not yet dealt with it. But in the most up-to-date Slavic and Indo-European etymological lexicography (cf. Derksen 2007: 565 and LIV 1: 185, respectively), it is still rendered a continuant of PIE **g^(u)eldh-* (whose post-verbal **g^(u)oldh-* is in Slavic languages reflected solely by PSl. **goldŭ* 'hunger'). However, the limited distribution of the recorded attestations – especially the isolated nature of those from Russian Church Slavonic – arouses serious suspicion about the standard, entrenched supposition that these are remote (implicitly also independent) relicts of a once more widespread verb. (Reasons for its disappearance, especially with regard to the broad attestation of the noun **goldŭ*, are not easy to find). On the other hand, it is plausible to interpret the verb, not as a Proto-Slavic dialectism, but as a medieval, probably Old Serbian (and not Serbian Slavonic, as a recension of Church Slavonic) innovation in the central South Slavic region.

1 A review of the **history** of the lexicographic attestedness of this verb (and its lexical-semantic family) reveals the fact that previous references do contain elements hitherto not taken into consideration in etymological interpretation.

The article results from research on the project Nr. 178007 "Etimološka istraživanja srpskog jezika i izrada *Etimološkog rečnika srpskog jezika*" which is fully financed by the Ministry of education and science of the Republic of Serbia.

1.1 Miklosich (1862–1865: 199) records “жлъдѣти ‘desiderare’: народъ жлъдеце любовьюми hom.-mih, mon.-serb. 197, mon.-serb. 476, serb. *žudjeti*; *požuda* mik., scr. *grdhu* m. ‘amor’, жлъдати ‘cupere’ mon.-serb. 41.9.17., жлъдъ ‘res desiderata’: обрѣтж чистъ хлѣбъ, велиини [sic!] рыбы и вино различно и кондито и вса жлъди pat.-mih. 159, жлъдынъ ‘cupidus’ alex.-mih. 192, жлъдостъ ‘cupido’ men.-mih. 288”. A closer look at the sources shows that they are all in fact Old Serbian manuscripts, except for one that features the postverbal noun жлъдъ ‘res desiderata’, the so-called *Mihanović Patericon*, which is of undoubted Bulgarian provenance and dated into the first half of the 14th c. (cf. § 2.2, note 9).

1.2 The verb is then interpreted by **Miklosich** (1886: 62 s.v. *geld-*): “asl. *žlǫděti* aus *želděti* ‘begehren’. *žlǫdъ* ‘das gewünschte’. s. *žudjeti*, *požuda*, *žudan* ‘durstig’. Aus *geld* durch steig. *goldъ*...”¹

1.3 Later **Berneker** (1908–1913: 320 s.v. *goldъ*) mentions *žlǫděti* (without specifying the language – obviously rendering it a PSl. form), in the context of the already established comparison with OInd. forms (after Fick and Uhlenbeck: *gr̥dh̥yati* ‘ist gierich’, *gárdhas* ‘Gier’) – and concludes that it exhibits an *r : l* alternation, perhaps under the influence of the word family of *želěti*.²

1.4 After that the verb is recorded in the mid 20th c. by etymological dictionaries of the languages it is (presumably) attested in.

1.4.1 **Фасмер** (1986–1987, 1: 430) s.v. *зѡлод* interprets this noun as an o-grade of the verb represented, besides Serbian Slavonic жлъдѣти, also by Russian Church Slavonic жлъдѣти – however he gives no ubication for the latter, and we could not find it in relevant references either (for other forms cf. § 2.1), hence its attestedness must be subject to doubt.

1.4.2 **Skok** (1971–1974, 1: 563–564 s.v. *glad*) presents a fine digest of relevant data, while adopting the ultimate interpretation from Фасмер i.e. Miklosich): “Ništični prijevojni stepen **ghǫld-* [sic!] nalazi se samo u hrv.-srp. inhoativu na -ěti *žúdjati*, *žúdim* (Vuk), (do-, po-) ‘željeti u jačem stepenu, desiderare’, stcslav. srpske redakcije *žlǫděti*, *žlǫždq*. Odatle pridjev na -ъn *žúdan* (Vuk) ‘žedan’, postverbal *požuda* f., ... apstraktum na -nja *žúdnja* f. i *žuđenje* n. Taj igra veliku ulogu u dubrovačkoj petrarkističkoj lirici. ... Vokal *u* je nastao od sonantnog *l*. Korišten je ie. **gheldh-*, odatle praslav. prijevoj na o **goldъ*, upor. sanskr. *gardha-h* ‘požuda’, *gr̥dh̥ayati* ‘lakom je, žestoko traži’.”

1 Following are continuants of this PSl. noun, and finally parallels like “lit. *gardus* ‘wohlschmeckend’. ai. *grdh*, *grdhjati*, *gardha* ‘gier’. got. *grēdus* wird auf *gardus* zurückgeführt.”

2 He wonders: “Kam vielleicht das *l* für *r* durch Kreuzung mit der Sippe von *želěq*, *želěti* ... zustande?”

1.4.3 Most recently **Derksen** reconstructs PSl. *žьlděti ‘[to] desire’ on the basis of a single Church Slavonic record in the form of RuCS žьlděti ‘desire’³ and a South Slavic one in the form of S.-Cr. žúdjeti (Vuk: SW)⁴ ‘desire’, interpreted solely with the comment “See → gōldъ” (Derksen 2007: 565). However, this noun is explained just as “A masculine o-stem from the verbal root attested in *žьlděti” (ibid. 173–174), which is a circular definition, rather than an interpretation.

1.4.4 Much the same in **LIV** (1: 185 s.v. *g^(u)eld^h- ‘gierich werden, hungrig werden’), supposed is an -l- in the root, and as OInd. continuants offered is Ved. ágr̥dhat ‘ist gierich geworden’ etc. (all with an -r-!). Added to them, with a question mark, is Russian Church Slavonic žьlděti ‘sich sehnen’, and only in the footnote is it mentioned that the initial guttural was reconstructed as a labiovelar only by O. Szemerényi in 1967.⁵

1.4.5 **Vaillant** gives a PSl. reconstruction of the verb (followed by OSerb. and S.-Cr. forms only, but he actually does not render it a PSl. word since he states explicitly that the only PSl. form is the noun *gōldъ. Noteworthy is his comment that the existence of the OSerb. forms in -ati is of no consequence, since it only imitates the variation of flexion in similar verbs želěti and želati, žęděti and žędati (Vaillant 1966: 386, 372).

1.4.6 And finally, **KEPC** offers the interpretation presented here in § 3.2.1.

2 The newest sources for descriptive dictionaries of the two relevant languages, from the end of the 20th c., provide somewhat richer materials for Old Russian and an abundance for Serbo-Croatian.

2.1 In Modern Russian this verb, or its derivatives, is not attested – either in its standard variety or in dialects. But the dictionary of **Old Russian** (СРЯ XI–XVII, 5: 120, in fact after Sreznevskij) although not featuring the verb proper,⁶ does record the postverbal noun жьдъ ‘удовольствие’, its derivative adjective жьдъный, as well as the compound adjective жьдолоубивый nominalized into a nomen agentis ‘тот кто любит удовольствия, склонный к удовольствиям’.

3 Missing are Miklosich’s examples from Serbian Slavonic and Bulgarian Slavonic.

4 The information in brackets is in fact misleading, since it implies that the verb is restricted to the South-West of the Serbian language territory, while Vuk himself gives other varieties from elsewhere.

5 In the journal *Welt der Slaven* 12, 274: “wegen (unsicheren) wurzeletymologischen Vergleichs mit aksl. želěti ‘wünschen’, gr. βούλομαι”.

6 It is also missing from Sreznevskij’s dictionary (which does feature the noun and adjective), so that Vasmer’s example remains a phantom – unless it was his own reconstruction based on the noun.

2.1.1 Important is the fact that all three words come from the **same source**, the *Sinai Patericon*, more or less unanimously dated to the turn of the 12th c. (for more details, see below). So, since nowhere else is either the verb or its derivatives to be found (neither the three mentioned above, nor any others), there are grounds to doubt that they are autochthonous in Old Russian,⁷ i.e. it allows us to suppose that they are imported from the protograph of the *Sinai Patericon*.

2.1.2 This **protograph** is undoubtedly a South Slavic translation of the Greek original, and its language is today characterized as late Old Church Slavonic i.e. the Church Slavonic of Bulgarian recension with elements of SW Bulgarian dialects (thus about it Пожгаи 2003: 91–92,⁸ with a review on discussion of various datings).

2.2 It is noteworthy that **Bulgarian** sources, for modern and medieval language alike, do not feature this word family, not even some continuant of the noun жлъдь ‘res desiderata’ recorded in the first half of the 14th c. in the so-called *Mihanović Patericon* which is considered to belong to the Bulgarian recension of Church Slavonic.⁹ Hence, on the basis of the single attestation in a document of Bulgarian recension, as compared with the three forms and four attestations in the *Sinai Patericon*, dating from the beginning of the 11th c., it can be judged that in the course of those four centuries, 10th–14th, the word family was lost in Bulgarian Slavonic, only to appear in the early 14th c. in the form of the noun solely – by then already a hapax legomenon.

2.3 As for the numerous **Serbian** attestations, verbs and derivatives alike, there is the question of the vernacular or literary character of those words (the editors of RJA, e.g. s.v. *požuda* state explicitly that it is a literary word, while in PCA many derivatives bear the qualification “poetic” – which seems to be true, judging by the sources). It is our thesis that *žud(j)eti* is both a literary and vernacular word (which was not the case in Russian and Bulgarian). Because of that, for the sake of illustration and documentation, we shall first present the attestations of the basic (and/or prefixed) verb in modern dialectal dictionaries, and then concentrate on the rest of the materials – modern, obsolete and

7 Cf. Иванова (1965: 149–150), Шонкой (1975: 202–203), for the entire text Гольщенко – Дубровина (1967).

8 Here we do not deal with the terminological problem arising from the fact that in references published in Bulgaria – which is the case here – Old Church Slavonic is termed „Old Bulgarian“ – hence our formulation of Pozsgai’s diagnosis „south to central late Bulgarian“.

9 So about the manuscript „pat. mih.“ which is kept in the Austrian National Library under the call number ÖNB – Cod. slav. 152, aS – Cod. slav. 137, Birkfellner (1975: 261–263).

historical – from large dictionaries, in order to reconstruct the semantic scope and evolution of meanings of the verb.

2.3.1 Examples from **dialects** cover most of the Štokavian terrain, from Lika and Dubrovnik in the West, via northern Montenegro, Raška, Kopaonik to Pomoravlje and Vojvodina:¹⁰ *žuditi* ‘to crave’ (Lika, Стојаковић – Мандарић 2013: 42); *žúdjēt/žúđēt* ‘to long for sb./sth.’: *žuđela za bokunić svoje kućice* (Dubrovnik, Бојанић – Тривунац 2002: 111); *žúđeti* ‘to desire, crave’, *žuđan* ‘desirous of sth.’, *žuđnik* ‘the one who longs for sth.’, *žuđenik* ‘dožud’ [cf. § 2.3.1.1] (Uskoci, Станић 1990–1991, 1: 202); *žudjeti* ‘to crave’, *žudan* ‘desirous of sth.’ (Nikšić, Ђоковић 2005: 64); *žuđeti* ‘to crave’: *mlogo žudim za jagnječim mesom* (Prošćenje, Вујичић 1995: 39); *žuđet* ‘to like (sth.)’: *Božo mlogo žudi voće* (Vasojević, Стијовић 1990: 174); *žudovati* ‘id.’: *žuduje ... za kiselu papriku* (Pomoravlje, PCA); *žudovat* ‘id.’, *žudan* ‘desirous [of certain food]’: *žena trudna, kiseloga žudna* (Kopaonik, Радич 2010: 109–110).¹¹ Moving eastward the meanings change from the general to those specifically limited to food.

2.3.1.1 A semantic specialisation onto the affective domain (and geographical onto northern Montenegro) exhibits the verb **prefixed** with **do-** and its derivatives: *dožuđeti* pf. ‘to live to see sth.’, *dòžud* m./f. ‘the favourite child; child whose birth was expected with great longing’, *dòžudnik* m. / *dòžudnica* f. ‘id.; a dear man/woman’ (Станић, Вујичић, Ђоковић l.c.). That the use of this prefix is not accidental – nor new – is testified by examples from folk poetry (from the same region): *dožud(j)eti* ‘to live to see (with longing)’: *Ili si se zaželjela | Đeverova sokolova | Koji su te dožuđeli; dožud(a)* m., f. ‘a much longed for child’: *Svakog sunce ogrijalo, | Snago moja! | Ama nije majku moju, | Moj dožuđe!, ... Divno si se okitio kitom braće! | S tri dožuda dece tvoje; dòžudnik* m. / *dòžudnica* f. ‘id.’: *Bog mu dade jedno muško čedo | I krotio dožudnika sina; ... Aleksije, sine dožudniče* (PCA). That this is by no means a local phenomenon, is testified to by two writers, native to two remote regions, Hvar and Slavonia: *Ah, nema dank niti noći crne, | Da moje srce vidjet ga ne žudi, | I napokon ga dožudilo evo; Vrh u sveg ću tebe obožavat, | Ljepšeg raje ne možeš dožudit* (ibid.). The synonym of the same structure, *doželeći*, is also attested in folk poetry and with a few writers: *Što želio, to si doželio; dožele se ostarele majke*, etc. (ibid.).

2.3.2 The **usage** of the verb *žud(j)eti*, with old writers and in folklore, as is abundantly and variously attested in PCA and RJA, makes it possible – besides

10 This is perhaps influenced by the standard language, cf. in a religious context: *žúdit* ‘to desire strongly’: *Moje srce, o Bože, za tobom žudi* (in prayer) (Bunjevci, Peić – Bačlija 1990: 444).

11 The hapax legomenon *žudnica* f. ‘small red pimple on one’s face’ (Raška, PCA) is probably based on a wider local use of the verbal meaning ‘to desire passionately’, but it is not documented so far.

noting differences in **rection**,¹² or identifying the **inventory** of the subjects and objects of craving¹³ – to define quite clearly a few **semantic** domains of its usage.

2.3.2.1 Stunning is the frequency of the now archaic syntagm **želi i žudi**¹⁴ (with the variant **željno žudi**): *ako koga želiš i žudiš; zove te, ki te ... vilo žudi i želi dan i noć; što ova besjedenja žude i žele učiniti; željno žudim svako dobro* (RJA). It shows a gradation of the intensity of desiring – although in a number of examples the verb *žud(j)eti* stands by itself, instead of *žel(j)eti*, i.e. as its synonym in a neutral (but slightly intensified) sense.

2.3.2.2 Attested from the beginning of the 15th till the end of the 19th century is *žud(j)eti* ‘**to desire** (in general), long for’ (often with rections as in *žel(j)eti*): *Bogъ i prěčista* (scil. *bili s vama*) *vě mnogo žľdimo; Ja ti žudim dobru tvome kako, dušo, zdravlju mome; Tebi on žudi što žudi sam sebi; štedio konjica žudeć njega svesti na Cetinje; žude l’ dovest’ u dvoru odmjenu; Sila pravdu ne žudi; Je li grijeh žudjeti smrt?; kum i prijatelj žudio ... da dođe i prispije; nekome treba za opanke, a njekoji i popivku žudi* (RJA). In the same meaning, as early as 1253 AD, there is Serbian Slavonic form in *-ati: жљдајуће тебе ... царъ* (ibid.).

2.3.2.2.1 Here also belong, probably as literary creations (hence the editors’ note s.v. *požudan*, cf. § 2.3), prefixed forms of the **participle** *ožuđen* arch. ‘who longs strongly; badly wanted, intensively craved for’: *svetlost ožuđenu; k cilju ožuđenom; da taj ožuđeni cilj postigne; ožuđeno ono i zgodno vrijeme* (PCA), then *požudan* ‘dear, beloved’ (for the same word-formation cf. *poželjan*), as well as the postverbal arch. *požuda* ‘the one who is dear to someone’ (RJA); for the formal-semantic counterpart dial. *dožud(a)*, cf. § 2.2.1.

2.3.2.3 The nowadays standard meaning *žud(j)eti* ‘to wish passionately, carnally; **love**’ was recorded as early as the 15th–16th century: *Ljubomir ... Tirenu ... žudi; Otkrivene prsi bijele, tko da ... ne žudi?; U velikoj on požudi ... mē došastije čeka i žudi; plemenite ... vile ... lele tomu, ko ih žudi; duša moja žudi tebe; Oblač na se lijepo odijelo, pa ti sađi pred bijelu kulu, jer te žudi Smederevac Đuro; ako žudiš kojugod milost telesnu; što m[oj]a bludnost većma žudi* (RJA); *žuđenje* ‘dear, badly wanted person’ (like, e.g., *gledanje, milovanje* ‘sweetheart’): *Tu će ti doći žuđenje, | Vozi je dvoru svojemu; probudih se u ljubavi, žuđenje moje; ja gledam žuđenje svoje, žuđenik/žuđenica* ‘the one who is longed for’ (PCA); here also dial. *žudnica* ‘small red pimple on one’s face’ (Raška, ibid.).

12 Sometimes the verb goes with accusative, i.e. ~ *nešto* (like with *žel(j)eti*), sometimes with instrumental, i.e. ~ *za nečim* (like with *čeznuti*).

13 The subjects are heart, soul, temper – which indicates that it is rooted in the domain of abstract semantics – while the objects are more diverse: peace, mercy, God, salvation, justice, perfection, also death, and indulgence – carnal, gastronomic, or just in water.

14 Perhaps (if the interpretation in § 3.2.1 is correct) it was originally tautological, like *mio i drag* ‘beloved and dear’.

2.3.2.4 Similar is the chronology of the presently archaic meaning *žud(j)eti* ‘to thirst’, cf. especially the syntagm *žudan i gladan* (in Vuk’s dictionary),¹⁵ *Malko gladan a malko i žudan* (PCA), whose origination can be traced through examples where the object of craving is specifically water, milk, a drop, rain, dew, fig. also blood: *Žedan jelin žudi vrutak vode žive*; *Kako ... djeca mlijeko žudite*; *košuta ranjena žudi kladenac od voda*; *žude njive plodne daž veseli rose ugodne*; *od kaplje manje žudih* (RJA); *Kukuruzi smoreno šušte, žudni, prežudni kiše* (PCA); also: *čudna žudnja krvi i mejdana* (RJA). Special attention should be paid to the tau-tology (?), *Mi smo žedni i žudni vode rajske* (ibid.).

2.3.2.5 Quite non-standard is the semantics related to **food**, e.g. in the post-verbal (?) used by Ragusean Vlaho Bukovac: *jaka žud za domaćom hranom* (PCA), although it is clearly attested in dialects (cf. § 2.3.1 for examples related to mutton, fruit, pickled peppers).

2.3.2.6 Semantically apart stands the relatively novel (?) nomen agentis *žudenik* ‘a buyer, client’ (attested only twice, in the western parts) as a specific realisation of the basic meaning ‘to wish, demand’: *žito ... na tržište iznijeli ... gdje će ga svi ... koji su toj hrani žudenici (mušterije) zgledati*; *što su sleplji kupci žudenici, tim je njemu više praćikanja* (RJA).

2.4 Such a semantic image allows, even requires, that the **original meaning** of the verb *žud(j)eti* be supposed as an abstract ‘to wish’ (and the interpretation looked for in the relation with *žel(j)eti*), or as a concrete ‘to thirst’ (and the interpretation looked for in the relation with *žeđati*), perhaps even in ‘to go hungry’ (and the interpretation looked for in the relation with *gladneti/gladovati*, although that is – if the verb turns out to be more recent in origin and not of PIE antiquity – word-formation-wise least probable). In the first case, the meanings ‘to crave’, ‘to thirst’, ‘to go hungry’ would be derived, independently from ‘to wish’, and in the other case, from the concrete ‘to thirst’ an abstract ‘to crave, wish strongly (spiritually or carnally)’, and from it a concrete ‘to be hungry (for something)’. So, besides homophony, the verbs *žel(j)eti*, *žeđati*, *žud(j)eti* also share the same semantic triangle. After Berneker’s idea about crossing with **želēti* (cf. § 1.3), Vaillant also placed these three verbs together when he supposed that behind the alternation of Serbian Slavonic *жѣдѣти* : *жѣдѣти* there is an analogy with *želēti* and *želati*, *žēdēti* and *žēdati* (cf. Vaillant 1966: 386, 372, § 1.4.5).

2.5 An over-view of all the materials reveals a **discrepancy** between, on the one hand, the absence of attestation of a corresponding form not only in

15 Frequent in folk poetry is the pair *žedan i gladan*: *ni žedan ni gladan*; *il’ si gladan*, *il’ si žedan*, etc.

Russian but also in Bulgarian (in whose most westward dialects the word was, apparently, autochthonous at the time of origination of the translation from Greek – which served as a protograph to the *Sinai Patericon*, cf. § 2.1.2), and on the other hand, abundant attestedness and intensive usage of the verb *žu-d(j)eti* (also with prefixes *do-*, *o-*, *po-*), derived nouns (*žud*, *žudnja*; *dožud*, *požuda*) and adjectives (*žudan*, *ožuđen*, *požudan*) in Serbo-Croatian. This has been the case continually, from the Middle Ages till today (apart from literary usage – in Serbian Slavonic, then in the Dubrovnik literature and among writers from Dalmatia and Bosnia – also in folk poetry and among writers strongly rooted in folk tradition, e.g. Vuk Karadžić, Vuk Vrčević, Luka Grdić-Bjelokosić, Petar Kočić, Branko Radičević). This was a consequence of its further expansion towards the (north)west i.e. the centre of the Štokavian terrain, where, in the course of time, it spread to the vernacular and further developed a lexical-semantic word family in Serbian.

3 All the presented materials, the scarce Church Slavonic (cf. § 1.1, 2.1, 2.2) and the quoted abundance of Serbian and Croatian (cf. § 2.3.1–2.3.2.6), call for a **reconsideration** of the existing etymology.

3.1 It reads (as stated, after Miklosich and Berneker, by Skok and Derksen) as follows: PSl. **žlděti* continues PIE **g^(u)eldh-* ‘to become eager, desirous; get hungry’ – but the verb is isolated in the Slavic South let alone the entire Slavic terrain – without Baltic parallels, with only OInd. ones (OInd. *āgr̥dhat* ‘he became desirous’, OInd. *jāgr̥dhūr* ‘they are desirous’), which, above all, entails the alternation *r/l*,¹⁶ while at the same time its umlauted form with *-o-* vocalism is the Common Slavic and Proto-Slavic noun **goldъ* – which would be an instance of uncommon disparity in the distributions of the deriving verb and derived noun.¹⁷ Since the only parallels to our verb, the Old Indic ones, are so distant, non-identical and few, the existing interpretation is almost a case of root etymology.

3.1.1 On the other hand, the **semantic typology** of the concept ‘to crave’ is not uniform, since in various Slavic languages it is nominated very differently (even multiply within a single language), e.g. Slovene *želeti si*, *hrepneti*, *koprneti* (Bezljaj 1976–2007 s.vv.); Polish *tesknić* ‘to long’, *pragnąć* ‘to wish, crave’, arch. ‘**to thirst**’, *wzdychać* ‘to long, yearn’ (Boryś 2005 s.vv.); Russian *жаждать* arch. ‘**to thirst**’, fig. ‘to crave, long for’, *страстно желать*, *стремиться* ‘to pursue, yearn’ (Фасмер 1986–1987 s.vv.) – all those beyond South Slavic

16 Which is possible, but for the validity of parallelism it would be better if it did not exist.

17 With the semantically close counterpart, also Common Slavic and PSl. **žędj(a)*, it is not the case.

(S.-Cr., Bulg. dial., Mac. dial.) *čeznuti* ‘to crave, yearn’ < PSl. **čeznŋti* ‘to get killed, vanish; pine, mourn’ (ЭССЯ 4: 100–101). In any case, this concept is nominated secondarily, metaphorically or by an outward manifestation of longing (dying for someone/something, thirsting, mourning, quaking, etc.).¹⁸

3.2 That is why it **can** be supposed that the verb *žud(j)eti* is yet another case of a local development – this time in Serbo-Croatian – as yet another special and specific realisation in the rich inventory of terms for ‘cupere’. At least three authors have had the idea, albeit unelaborated, of the intersection of **žьlděti* with *želěti*, and Vaillant hinted the homophonous semantic triangle formed by these two and **žeděti* (cf. § 1.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5).

3.2.1 With all this in mind, the most likely possibility seems to be that, as an Old Serbian **innovation** (OSerb. and Serbian Slavonic ЖАЉДѢТИ i.e. Church Slavonic ЖАЉДѢТИ) the form **žьld-* resulted from a dissimilation in the adjective **žedьnъ > žédan*, i.e. in its earlier form **žindīnŭ* which through a dissimilation $n - n > l - n$ ¹⁹ could have yielded **žildīnŭ > žьldьnъ*; in that case, the noun **žьldъ* and verb(s) **žьlděti, -ati* would be deadjectival derivations. This is quite possible if we accept the idea that the origination of nasal vowels from tautosyllabic groups “vowel + *n, m*” is a fairly late phenomenon, and that in late Proto-Slavic, in the Age of great migrations around 600 AD, these Balto-Slavic groups were still preserved. This has been covered in detail by Georg Holzer (most recently in Holzer 2013, with previous references); in his transcription, the original form of **žedьnъ* would have been **džindinu* (cf. ibid. 85 for the likes of it). So, the supposed dissimilatory development could have happened in the first centuries following the Slavic migration to the South, hence it is not only **formally** but also **chronologically** possible.²⁰

3.2.2 Absolute certainty about this process is impossible, yet it is important that such a development as ‘to thirst’ → ‘to desire’ → ‘to desire strongly, crave’ is also **semantically** likely (not necessarily in the given order) – which is attested in Serbian (exactly for these verbs: *žeđati, želeti, žudeti*) and also paralleled

18 Similarly, cf. Lat. *cupio* < PIE **kup(e)i-*, **kup-eH₁-* ‘to tremble, quake, desire’ (de Vaan 2008: 155), or Engl. *to thirst for* (e.g. he thirsted for absolute power, etc., cf. Buck 1965: 1161–1163); also the triad of Engl. *to long* < OE *long* ‘arouse desire, have a yearning desire’ < impers. ‘it seems long (to wait)’ < *long* adj. (ODEE 536; Buck 1965: 1163b), Engl. *crave* ‘demand; beg for, yearn for’, with the radical sense ‘force, exact’ (ODEE 225), Engl. *yearn* ‘have a strong desire’, like OHG *gern* ‘eager’ < PIE **g^her-* ‘desire; rejoice’ (ODEE 1019; Buck 1965: 1163a; LIV 176–177).

19 For the similar dissimilation cf. S.-Cr. *saonice* < **saьnice* < **saьnice* (cf. Pol. *sannice*), or S.-Cr. *salinac* aside dial. *saninac* (Skok 1971–1974, 3: 201 s.v. *sāni*).

20 The fact that this interpretation excludes the presumed relation between **žьlděti* and **goldъ* ‘hunger’ (perhaps even opens the question of the origin of the noun), remains beyond our concern at the moment.

in other languages. Not only does *žud(j)eti* sometimes mean simply ‘to desire’ (i.e. *žel(j)eti*, cf. § 2.3.2.2), but *žedati/žedati* is also attested in that meaning (cf. Serbian Slavonic *жедати* ‘to desire’). As a continuant of PSl. **žedati*, *žed’q* ‘id.’, it derives from PIE **g^(u)hed^h*- ‘to desire, crave’ along with Lith. *gedáuti* ‘to desire, mourn, crave’, Lith. *gedėti* ‘to long for something, mourn’, then Gk. *ποθέω* iter. ‘to long for, yearn after (what is absent), miss or regret (what is left or lost)’ (cf. also *πόθος* ‘longing, yearning, regret; love, desire’), or its aor. *θέσσασθαι* ‘to pray for’, OIr. *-guid*, Welsh *gweddio* ‘to pray, ask’ (cf. Fraenkel 1962–1965, 149–150 s.v. *gēsti* 2; LIV 217; Buck 1965: 1163b). For the transfer of the Slavic nasal infix from the present base into the verbal one cf. Lith. *pasigendù* ‘I crave’ (Vaillant 1966: 326). Besides, Russ. *жаждать* arch. ‘to thirst’ otherwise means ‘to crave, yearn for’, then Engl. *to thirst* also means ‘to crave for’ (e.g. *he thirsted for absolute power*), etc.

3.2.2.1 Regardless of all the genetic and typological parallels (which demonstrate that on the Proto-Slavic and PIE levels, the counterparts to Serb. *žedati/žedati* are as a rule polysemantic verbs), the key argument in favour of the proposed interpretation is furnished by numerous and various attestations of this very semantics on the local grounds, e.g. Serbian Slavonic *жедати* (13th c.) in the example *изъ юности моикъ жедахъ горѣнникомъ срьдъчнымъ* in a later translation features *žud(j)eti*: *Iz mladosti moje žudah plamom srdačnim*. Further, *žedati* ‘to long (carnally, spiritually, in general)’: *ja tebe vazda žedam; Duša moja ne žeda; Što žedaš? Ne žedam vode, nego vašu veru; Blaženi koji gladuju i žedaju pravde; iz žestoke žeđe za dobićom; u meni se malo ugasila žeđ biti soldatom*. Hence, *žedneti* is also defined by Stulli as fig. ‘to crave, wish’, apart from older attestations: *za tvojom ljubavim (sic!) budem vazda žednjeti; žednih spasenje od duša našijeh; istinu ... za kojom duh njegov žedni*. The transition from the domain of concrete into the abstract is best understood in the example of the adjective *žedan* ‘thirsty’: besides the dual syntagm *žedni i žudni vode rajske; žedan sam spasenja tvojeg*, *Gospode*, often in a negative context, via (symbolic) thirst for blood, and the idiom *žedan biti na koga* ‘to bear a grudge against smb. (lit. be thirsty towards someone)’, or ‘intend to do harm, evil’: *Turci žedni prehoditi Drinu, neki pješke, neki na dorinu; Crkava ... žedni Turci (tj. namerni da ih ruše)* (RJA), etc.

3.2.3 The question remains what the **impulse** for the formal-semantic evolution of *žedan* into *žudan* was: whether, at a certain point, the need arose for a formal distinction to accompany the semantic difference between concrete and abstract meanings,²¹ or something else was the case – still remains uncertain.

21 Cf. the case of the syntagm with phonetically varied pair of forms *žejati* and *žajati* or *žedni i žudni vode rajske*, also the variety in rection (genitive vs. accusative): *Što žedaš? Ne žedam vode, nego vašu veru* (RJA).

4 Apart from the concrete idea about the alternative to the existing interpretation (cf. § 3.2.1 ff.), this article can be understood as an example of correcting an existing interpretation – not, as is most usual, on the basis of new facts (although some more recent materials and a broader overview of previously published Serbo-Croatian materials do introduce some new details), but primarily on the basis of a reconsideration or checking the validity of standard sources in terms of **specifying the origin of the materials** they were compiled from.

References

- Berneker 1908–1913: Berneker, E., *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1, Heidelberg.
- Bezljaj 1976–2007: Bezljaj, F., *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*, 1–5, Ljubljana.
- Birkfellner 1975: Birkfellner G., *Glagolitische und kyrillische Handschriften in Österreich*, Wien.
- Boryś 2005: Boryś, W., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków.
- Buck ²1965: Buck, C.D., *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*, Chicago.
- de Vaan 2008: de Vaan, M., *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and Other Italic Languages*, Leiden – Boston.
- Derksen 2007: Derksen, R., *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden – Boston.
- Fraenkel 1962–1965: Fraenkel, E., *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1–2, Göttingen.
- Holzer 2013: Holzer, G., *Urslavische Wortlautungen*, In: Грковић-Мејдор, Ј. – Лома, А. (eds.), *Miklosichiana bicentennialia. Зборник у част двестоте годишњице рођења Франца Миклошича*, Београд, 65–87. Also available at: www.sanu.ac.rs/Izdanja/Elizdanja/PosebnaIzdanja674.pdf.
- LIV: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden ²2001.
- Miklosich 1862–1865: Miklosich, F., *Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum*, Wien. Reprint 1963.
- Miklosich 1886: Miklosich, F., *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen*, Wien.
- ODEE: *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Ed. by C. T. Onions, with the assistance of G. W. S. Friedrichsen and R. W. Burchfield, Oxford ¹²1985.
- Peić – Bačlija 1990: Peić, M. – Bačlija G., *Rečnik bačkih Bunjevaca*, Novi Sad – Subotica.
- RJA: *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, I–XXIII, Zagreb 1880–1976.
- Skok 1971–1974: Skok, P., *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 1–4, Zagreb.
- Vaillant 1966: Vaillant, A., *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, III, *Le verbe*, Paris.
- Бојанић – Тривунац 2002: Бојанић, М. – Тривунац, Р., *Рјечник дубровачког говора (= Српски дијалектолошки зборник XLIX)*.
- Вујичић 1995: Вујичић, М., *Рјечник говора Проиђења (код Мојковца)*, Подгорица.
- Голышенко – Дубровина 1967: Голышенко, В. С. – Дубровина В. Ф. (ур.), *Синайский патерик*, Москва.
- Ђоковић 2005: Ђоковић, Љ., *Говорни драгуљи никишићког краја*, Београд.
- Иванова 1965: Иванова, Т. А., *Заметки о лексике Синайского патерика (К вопросу о переводе Патерика Мефодием)*, In: *Проблемы современной филологии. Сборник статей к 70-летию акад. В. В. Виноградова*, Москва, 149–152.
- КЕРС: *Кратки етимолошки речник српског језика*, А. Лома (ур.) (у штампи).
- Пожгаи 2003: Пожгаи, И., *О древнеболгарском протографе Синайского патерика. Palaeobulgarica/Старобългаристика*, XXVII/1, 85–93.
- Радић 2010: Радић, П., *Копаонички говор. Етногеографски и културолошки приступ*, Београд.
- РСА: *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика*, 1–, Београд 1959–.
- СРЯ XI–XVII: *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв.*, 1–, С. Г. Бархударов (ред.), Москва.
- Станић 1990–1991: Станић, М., *Ускочки речник*, 1–2, Београд.

СТИЈОВИЋ 1990: Стијовић, Р., Из лексики Васојевића, Српски дијалектолошки зборник xxxvi, 121–380.

СТОЈАКОВИЋ – МАНДАРИЋ 2013: Стојаковић, А. – Мандарић, Ј., Рјечник личког говора, Београд.
 ФАСМЕР 1986–1987: Фасмер, М., *Этимологический словарь русского языка*, 1–4, перевод с немецкого и дополнения О. Н. Трубачева, Москва.

ШОНКОЙ 1975: Шонкой, П., Из лексики Синайского патерика. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József Nominatae. Dissertationes Slavicae* ix–x, Szeged, 183–203.

Црквенословенско *žlǫdēti* ‘desiderare, cupere’ – реликт или иновација. У раду се указује на проблематичност постојеће (од Миклошича до Дерксена) претпоставке о прасловенској – самим тим и индоевропској – старини глагола **žlǫdēti* ‘desiderare’ тако што се на нивоу црквенословенског региструје његова непосредоченост у рускословенском и оспорава аутохтоност изведеница у староруском – за које се испоставља да су јужнословенског порекла. Затим се констатује одсуство континуитета глагола и/ли изведеница у бугарском. Са друге стране, у српско-хрватском се, на централном штокавском терену, документује изразито добра посведоченост глагола и изведеница, и то континуирано од xiii века до данас, у књижевном језику (почев од српскословенског) и у народном стваралаштву, закључно са савременим дијалекатским потврдама. Стога се, практично искључивши и могућност да је глагол старословенски, предлаже алтернативно тумачење с.-х. *жуд(ј)ети* као локално развијене творбе, секундарно развијене од придева *жедан* (< **žēdъnъ*), преко његовог ранијег лика **žindīnъ* који је дисимилацијом *n – n > l – n* могао дати **žildīnъ* > *žlǫdъnъ*. Предочавају се формално-семантичке односно типолошке паралеле оваквом развоју, на примерима из српског и других језика, словенских и несловенских.

Јасна Влајић-Поповић • jasna.vlajic@isj.sanu.ac.rs
 Етимолошки одсек, Институт за српски језик САНУ
 Кнез-Михаилова 36, 11000 Београд, Република Србија